

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS  
EASTERN DIVISION

LACRETIA RACHEL NICKSON,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
MONARCH RECOVERY  
MANAGEMENT, INC.,  
Defendant.

CIVIL COMPLAINT

CASE NO. 1:17-cv-05862

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

**COMPLAINT**

NOW comes LACRETIA RACHEL NICKSON (“Plaintiff”), by and through her attorneys, Sulaiman Law Group, Ltd. (“Sulaiman”), complaining as to the conduct of MONARCH RECOVERY MANAGEMENT, INC. (“Defendant”), as follows:

**NATURE OF THE ACTION**

1. Plaintiff brings this action for damages pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (“FDCPA”) under 15 U.S.C. §1692 *et seq.*, the Telephone Consumer Protection Act (“TCPA”) under 47 U.S.C. §227 *et seq.*, and the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act (“ICFA”) under 815 ILCS 505/1 *et seq.*, for Defendant’s unlawful conduct.

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

2. This action arises under and is brought pursuant to the FDCPA and TCPA. Subject matter jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by 15 U.S.C §1692, 47 U.S.C §227, 28 U.S.C. §§1331 and 1337, as the action arises under the laws of the United States. Supplemental jurisdiction exists for the state law claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1337.

3. Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 as Defendant conducts business and maintains significant contacts within the Northern District of Illinois.

#### **PARTIES**

4. Plaintiff is a 35 year-old natural “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. §153(39).

5. Defendant states its mission is, “To help our clients recover outstanding debt through best practices and the latest technology, resulting in the highest level of compliance, performance and satisfaction.”<sup>1</sup> Located at 10965 Decatur Road, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Defendant is a third party collection agency that is in the business of collecting consumer debts on behalf of others, including debt allegedly owed by Plaintiff.

6. Defendant is a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. §153(39).

7. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives and insurers at all times relevant to the instant action.

#### **FACTS SUPPORTING CAUSES OF ACTION**

8. In approximately July 2016, Plaintiff obtained a consumer line of credit from Premier Bank.

9. Eventually, Plaintiff missed a payment, thus incurring debt (“subject debt”).

10. In an attempt to resolve the subject debt, Plaintiff called Premier Bank and made scheduled payment arrangements with it.

11. However, in approximately June 2017, Plaintiff began receiving phone calls to her cellular phone, (248) XXX-5414, from Defendant, seeking to collect upon the subject debt.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://monarchrm.com/about-us/>

12. At all times relevant to the instant action, Plaintiff was the sole subscriber, owner, and operator of the cellular phone ending in 5414. Plaintiff is and always has been financially responsible for the cellular phone and its services.

13. Defendant has mainly called Plaintiff's cellular phone using the phone number (844) 205-2138, but upon belief, it has used other numbers as well.

14. Upon information and belief, the above number ending in 2138 is regularly utilized by Defendant during its debt collection activity.

15. Upon answering calls from Defendant, Plaintiff experiences a noticeable pause, lasting approximately four to five seconds in length, before a live representative begins to speak.

16. Upon speaking with Defendant, Plaintiff is informed that it is acting as a debt collector and is attempting to collect upon a debt.

17. Plaintiff has advised Defendant that she is aware of the debt, as she has previously made payment arrangements, and has demanded that it stop calling her.

18. Despite Plaintiff's requests, Defendant has continued to persistently call her cellular phone up until the date of the filing of this action.

19. Plaintiff has received not less than 9 calls from Defendant since asking it to stop calling.

20. Frustrated over Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff spoke with Sulaiman regarding her rights, resulting in expenses.

21. With the goal of specifically addressing Defendant's conduct, Plaintiff has expended approximately \$61.00 to purchase and maintain an application on her cellular phone to help quell Defendant's calls. However, the communications have continued.

22. Plaintiff has been unfairly and unnecessarily harassed by Defendant's actions.

23. Plaintiff has suffered concrete harm as a result of Defendant's actions, including but not limited to, invasion of privacy, aggravation that accompanies collection telephone calls, emotional distress, increased risk of personal injury resulting from the distraction caused by the never-ending calls, increased usage of her telephone services, loss of cellular phone capacity, diminished cellular phone functionality, decreased battery life on her cellular phone, and diminished space for data storage on her cellular phone.

**COUNT I – VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT**

24. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 23 as though fully set forth herein.

25. Plaintiff is a “consumer” as defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3) of the FDCPA.

26. Defendant is a “debt collector” as defined by §1692a(6) of the FDCPA, because it regularly use the mail and/or the telephone to collect, or attempt to collect, delinquent consumer accounts.

27. Defendant is engaged in the business of collecting or attempting to collect, directly or indirectly, defaulted debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due to others. Defendant identifies itself as a debt collector and has been a member of the Association of Credit and Collection Professionals since 1990.<sup>2</sup>

28. The subject debt is a “debt” as defined by FDCPA §1692a(5) as it arises out of a transaction due or asserted to be owed or due to another for personal, family, or household purposes.

**a. Violations of FDCPA §1692c(a)(1) and §1692d**

29. The FDCPA, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692d, prohibits a debt collector from engaging “in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt.” §1692d(5) further prohibits, “causing a telephone to

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.acainternational.org/search#memberdirectory>

ring or engaging any person in telephone conversation repeatedly or continuously with intent to annoy, abuse, or harass any person at the called number.”

30. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1), d, and d(5) when it continuously called Plaintiff after being notified to stop. This repeated behavior of systematically calling Plaintiff’s phone over and over after she demanded that it cease contacting her was harassing and abusive. Defendant continued its onslaught of phone calls with the specific goal of oppressing and abusing Plaintiff.

31. Defendant was notified by Plaintiff that its calls were not welcomed. As such, Defendant knew that its conduct was inconvenient and harassing to her.

**b. Violations of the FDCPA § 1692e**

32. The FDCPA, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692e, prohibits a debt collector from using “any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt.”

33. In addition, this section enumerates specific violations, such as:

“The use of any false representation or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect any debt or to obtain information concerning a consumer.” 15 U.S.C. §1692e(10).

34. Defendant violated §1692e and e(10) when it used deceptive means to collect and/or attempt to collect the alleged debt. Despite being told to stop calling as she had already made payment arrangements surrounding the subject debt, Defendant continued to systematically place calls to Plaintiff’s cellular phone in a deceptive attempt to force her to answer its calls and ultimately make a payment. Through its conduct, Defendant misleadingly represented to Plaintiff that it had the legal ability to contact her via an automated system when it no longer had consent to do so.

**c. Violations of FDCPA § 1692f**

35. The FDCPA, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692f, prohibits a debt collector from using “unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.”

36. Defendant violated §1692f when it unfairly and unconscionably attempted to collect on a debt by continuously calling Plaintiff after she notified it to stop. Attempting to coerce Plaintiff into payment by placing voluminous phone calls after being notified to stop calling is unfair and unconscionable behavior. These means employed by Defendant only served to worry and confuse Plaintiff.

37. As pled in paragraphs 19 through 23, Plaintiff has been harmed and suffered damages as a result of Defendant’s illegal actions.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, LACRETIA RACHEL NICKSON, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in her favor as follows:

- a. Declaring that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and violate the aforementioned bodies of law;
- b. Awarding Plaintiff statutory damages of \$1,000.00 as provided under 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. Awarding Plaintiff actual damages, in an amount to be determined at trial, as provided under 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(1);
- d. Awarding Plaintiff costs and reasonable attorney fees as provided under 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(3); and
- e. Awarding any other relief as this Honorable Court deems just and appropriate.

**COUNT II – VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT**

38. Plaintiff repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 37 as though fully set forth herein.

39. The TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(iii), prohibits calling persons on their cellular phone using an automatic telephone dialing system (“ATDS”) without their consent. The TCPA, under 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1), defines an ATDS as “equipment which has the capacity...to

store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator; and to dial such numbers.”

40. Defendant used an ATDS in connection with its communications directed towards Plaintiff’s cellular phone. The noticeable pause, lasting approximately four to five seconds in length, which Plaintiff experiences during answered calls from Defendant is instructive that an ATDS is being utilized to generate the phone calls. Additionally, the nature and frequency of Defendant’s contacts points to the involvement of an ATDS.

41. Defendant violated the TCPA by placing phone calls to Plaintiff’s cellular phone using an ATDS without her consent. Any consent that Plaintiff *may* have given to the originator of the consumer debt, which Defendant will likely assert transferred down, was specifically revoked by Plaintiff’s numerous demands that it cease contacting her.

42. The calls placed by Defendant to Plaintiff were regarding collection activity and not for emergency purposes as defined by the TCPA under 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A)(i).

43. Under the TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B), Defendant is liable to Plaintiff for at least \$500.00 per call. Moreover, Defendant’s willful and knowing violations of the TCPA should trigger this Honorable Court’s ability to triple the damages to which Plaintiff is otherwise entitled to under 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, LACRETIA RACHEL NICKSON, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in her favor as follows:

- a. Declaring that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and violate the aforementioned statutes and regulations;
- b. Awarding Plaintiff damages of at least \$500.00 per phone call and treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §§ 227(b)(3)(B)&(C);
- c. Awarding Plaintiff costs and reasonable attorney fees; and

d. Awarding any other relief as this Honorable Court deems just and appropriate.

**COUNT III – VIOLATIONS OF THE ILLINOIS CONSUMER  
FRAUD AND DECEPTIVE BUSINESS PRACTICES ACT AGAINST DEFENDANT**

44. Plaintiff restates and realleges paragraphs 1 through 43 as though fully set forth herein.

45. Plaintiff is a “person” and “consumer” as defined by 815 ILCS 505/1(c) and (e) of the ICFA.

46. Defendant’s collection calls to Plaintiff are “trade” and “commerce” as defined by 815 ILCS 505/1(f) of the ICFA.

47. The ICFA states:

“Unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices, including but not limited to the use or employment of any deception, fraud, false pretense, false promise, misrepresentation or the concealment, suppression or omission of any material fact, with intent that others rely upon the concealment, suppression or omission of such material fact . . . in the conduct of any trade or commerce are hereby declared unlawful whether any person has in fact been misled, deceived or damaged thereby.” 815 ILCS 505/2.

48. Defendant violated 815 ILCS 505/2 by engaging in an unfair and deceptive act or practice in contacting Plaintiff. It was unfair for Defendant to relentlessly contact Plaintiff through means of an ATDS when she demanded that it stop calling her. Defendant ignored Plaintiff’s demands and continued to systematically place calls to her cellular phone without her consent. Following its characteristic behavior in placing voluminous calls to consumers, Defendant engaged in an unfair and deceptive act, willfully done with the hope that Plaintiff would be compelled to make payment.

49. Even though Defendant has been a member of the ACA for 27 years, its behavior here is far from lawful under the aforementioned statutes, including the ICFA.

50. The ICFA was designed to protect consumers, such as Plaintiff, from the exact behavior committed by Defendant.

51. The ICFA further states:

“Any person who suffers actual damage as a result of a violation of this Act committed by any other person may bring an action against such person. The court, in its discretion may award actual economic damages or any other relief which the court deems proper.” 815 ILCS 505/10a.

52. As pled in paragraphs 19 through 23, Plaintiff has suffered actual damages as a result of Defendant’s unlawful practices, including costs associated with purchasing and maintaining a blocking application subscription. As such, Plaintiff is entitled to relief pursuant to 815 ILCS 505/10a.

53. An award of punitive damages is appropriate because Defendant’s conduct was outrageous, willful and wanton, and showed a reckless disregard for the rights of Plaintiff. Defendant acted in defiance of Plaintiff’s prompts. Defendant was notified by Plaintiff that she did not wish to receive any more phone calls as she had already made payment arrangements on the underlying subject debt. Yet, Plaintiff was still bombarded with collection phone calls from Defendant. In an unfair and deceptive manner, Defendant called Plaintiff at least 9 times in an attempt to harass her into submission. After the initial conversation in which Plaintiff notified it that that she did not wish to be contacted further, Defendant had more than enough information to know that it should not continue calling her. Defendant, in defiance of the law, falsely and deceptively represented that it had the legal ability to contact Plaintiff seeking collection of debt when it did not. Upon information and belief, Defendant regularly engages in the above described behavior against consumers in Illinois and for public policy reasons should be penalized.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, LACRETIA RACHEL NICKSON, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court enter judgment in her favor as follows:

- a. Declaring that the practices complained of herein are unlawful and violate the aforementioned statutes and regulations;
- b. Awarding Plaintiff actual and punitive damages, in an amount to be determined at trial, for the underlying violations;
- c. Awarding Plaintiff costs and reasonable attorney fees;
- d. Enjoining Defendant from further contacting Plaintiff; and
- e. Awarding any other relief as this Honorable Court deems just and appropriate.

Dated: August 11, 2017

s/ Nathan C. Volheim  
Nathan C. Volheim, Esq. #6302103  
Counsel for Plaintiff  
Admitted in the Northern District of Illinois  
Sulaiman Law Group, Ltd.  
2500 South Highland Ave., Suite 200  
Lombard, Illinois 60148  
(630) 568-3056 (phone)  
(630) 575-8188 (fax)  
nvolheim@sulaimanlaw.com

Respectfully submitted,

s/Taxiarchis Hatzidimitriadis  
Taxiarchis Hatzidimitriadis, Esq. #6319225  
Counsel for Plaintiff  
Admitted in the Northern District of Illinois  
Sulaiman Law Group, Ltd.  
2500 South Highland Ave., Suite 200  
Lombard, Illinois 60148  
(630) 581-5858 (phone)  
(630) 575-8188 (fax)  
thatz@sulaimanlaw.com